Remarks

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-26 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 7 and 13 being the independent claims. Claims 2, 5, 8 and 11 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. New claims 19-26 are sought to be added. Entry of the present amendments is respectfully requested.

Based on the present Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Action on pages 2-5, claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by JP 11095793A to Yano et al (hereinafter "Yano"). Claims 5 and 11 are cancelled, rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 10, 12, 13, and 16-18.

As amended, claim 1 recites a speech complementing apparatus comprising: means for *repeatedly and continuously detecting whether or not there is a filled pause* in a user's speech, *wherein said filled pause is a trigger for complementing*; means for recognizing said user's speech in parallel with said detecting whether or not there is said filled pause; means for *complementing a language part to the fragment of the language spoken by the user when said filled pause is detected* by said means for detecting; and means for outputting a result of recognizing by said means for recognizing when no filled pause was detected. Yano fails to teach at least one limitation of claim 1.

Yano does not teach complementing a language part to the fragment of the language spoken by the user when a filled pause is detected. Instead, Yano teaches that a key-word in the form of a wild card in speech is complemented considering that the key-word is some string. Many combinations of words, including the key-word, are predetermined, or the key-word is word-spotted, to complement the key-word when the key-word is included in the speech. In one

-9-

method in Yano, when there is no key-word in the speech that is also in a predetermined combination, the system cannot complement the key-word in the speech. If there are many predetermined combinations, the system's processing speed will slow. In another method in Yano, the system cannot recognize the same word in a speech as a key-word.

In contrast, in claim 1, a filled pause is used to trigger complementing, which prevents the problems associated with Yano. Further, the apparatus of claim 1 can detect a filled pause in any part of a word because the detection of a filled pause in the speech is executed continuously and repeatedly in parallel with the recognition of the speech. As Yano does not disclose, teach, or suggest the aforementioned claim elements, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 4-6 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 7 and 13, as amended, recite elements similar to claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons given above for claim 1. Claims 10-12 and 16-18 depend from allowable claims and are allowable as being dependent from allowable claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Action on page 6, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Yano in view of U.S. Patent O'Shaughnessy et al (hereinafter "O'Shaughnessy"). Claims 2 and 8 are canceled, rendering the rejection moot. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 3, 9, 14, and 15.

Claims 3, 9, 14, and 15 are dependent from allowable claims as discussed above, and are allowable as being dependent from allowable claims. O'Shaughnessy teaches a method of identifying filled pauses in speech, but doe not disclose using a filled pause in the middle of speech as a trigger for complementing. Further, the combination of Yano and O'Shaughnessy does not overcome the deficiencies of Yano or O'Shaughnessy. Specifically, the combination of Yano and O'Shaughnessy does not teach that the filled pause of any part of a word is detected and that the detection is continuously and repeatedly executed, when the word itself is

-10-

recognized. The combination also does not teach that the detected filled pause is used as a trigger for complementing the word. The combination further does not teach that detecting the filled pause in a speech and recognizing the speech are performed in parallel. Therefore, claims 3, 9, 14 and 15 are allowable and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

New Claims

Claims 19-26 are added.

Claim 19 is directed to forward complementing.

Claims 20-21 are directed to backward complementing.

Claim 22 is directed to complementing from a filled pause at the top of a word.

Claim 23 is directed to complementing from a filled pause at the end of a word.

Claim 24 is directed to providing a choice to a user of complementing candidates.

Claim 25 is directed to forward and backward complementing.

Claim 26 is directed to selecting a user's choice of a candidate for complementing by the user's speech.

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

A Notice of Allowance with claims 1, 3-4, 6-7, 9-10, 12-26 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 2-23-04

Jeff A. Kaminski
Registration No. 42,709
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

-12-